Pearce, IC/SA Joe B

Dear Jim and Mark,

1/9/85

The third batch of Mark's Hosty, etc. records come today and because I am not up to current snuff, instead of continuing on what I was doing re en banc petition I just sat and skimmed them. I'll be writing further about them. This batch has doc. nos. through 81.

I don't know if I did too much yesterday or could not take my brief exposure to today's cold but my walking theraphy was the poorest I can recall and by the time I was home from the post office I was weak, weary and a little fuzzy in the head. So, I may have missed things, particularly because of the boring nature of some and the difficulty of reading some of the copies.

Several things bear on my allegations of lying in the field offices case. For example, my attestation that there is a FCI file on Ruby in the DL office. Barrett confirmed this.

You are getting copies of non-record copies, probably from a special tickler of considerable size. The first batch did have serial numbers, but that does not mean that they came from the serialized, record copies. They can still have come from a tickler set. As I now recall, there was, as I attested, a Hosty 67 file in Dallas. This is in an earlier batch and I think Lil has already made a separate copy for me and about which I'll write later. (I'm hoping that this will wear off and that I can resume what I should be doing. Otherwise I'll make an appointment with the doctor because the first signs of ecchymosis were visible last night. I've a chest full of junk that is coming up slowly, with much hard coughing at night, thus the signs of rupture of small blood vessels on the abdomen.)

There is a reference to an SA Joe B. Pearce. My recollection is that at the time of the assassination he was an investigative clerk. So, if true, like some we are familiar with, he earned his spurs and became an SA. I do not recall seeing in the very large Hosty flap files I've gone over this statement, of LHO as an informer, but I could have forgotten. I did make a duplicate file for subject filing and it would be in there if disclosed to me. This reminds me of something from the past of which I then informed you, with a King assassination overlap. But first a comment on the internal investigation. They didn't even bother to hide its shallowness and perfunctory nature, and this also is clear in my subject file. I am certain I annotated as I read and if I did I sent you a copy. The FBI's IGs did all they could to discover as little as possible and make the result as uncertain as possible, thus eliminating the prospects of any criminal charges. My recollection that Mohr ordered the destruction appears to be confirmed, and one of the earlier-batch records states unequivocally that FBHQ did know about the whole thing at the time, something the IGs tried to leave fuzzy.

There was a strange guy I've never met and who thereafter moved around much who wrote me from I think Seattle, and after some time he told me that his landlord was a former SA named C, later identified as Carter, that he had been in the KC office with Hosty, was black, and that Hosty had talked to him. He once told me that Hosty had left a note for Oswald, which made me wonder. But I did some checking and Carter had been an SA, listed in the organization of SA's book. The import of his Hosty story is that LHO had been an informant, quit, and Hosty was hassling him to get him back. I have no reason to believe it, much as this guy said that was straight.

One of the earlier batches has a record indicating that Hoover praised Hosty for his WC testimony. This third batch has xeroxes of it as printed containing Hosty's perjury, the same pages I used in appeals and O'322. I used more. Hosty states that LHO gave no indication of any tendency toward violence.

Reminds me, on Pearce, the internal record states that the WC had investigated

and found it not to be true. The "investigation" consisted of Hoover's pro forma denial and Pearce was not a commission witness.

In connection with withholding the names of FBI employees: three lists in this batch alone.

What may be of interest to Garys Shaw and Mack re the pix of a man with Walthers on the grassy strip south of Elm, picking something up: while he does not give a time, Barrett states he was there early and another SA was, name slipped my mind.

Also, I do not recall any earlier account of the FBI seeking footage than Barrett's, of being sent 11/25 to KRLD-TV.

Nor do I recall that the Schweiker subcommittee reported that it was told by Dallas SAs that they were instructed to avoid a real investigation and not to investigate any conspiracy possibilities, in questioning of Barrett.

Have you raised any question about the withholding as outside scope, which I take it "scope" means, if the info is not in itself exempt? Why withhold without needs which dealys and increases costs and requires subjective judgements? The AG did order maximum possible disclosure. Why not try to get them to stop such withholdings on that basis, that they are supposed to by the AG's order disclose all they can?

It would be good, in correspondence and in the future, if a series of records identified by document numbers only, with duplications of the numbers, had some other identification with them. Don't you get one?

After I clean up what I want to do with the petition and feel better I'll write you further about some of the records in these batches.

Best,